

REMARKS

The Examiner indicated claims 12-41 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the alleged rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, set forth in the Office Action. Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter.

The Examiner rejected claims 12-41 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Applicants respectfully traverse the § 112 rejections with the following arguments.

35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

The Examiner rejected claims 12-41 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The Examiner argues: “The preamble of claims 12, 22 and 32 are directed to a method for hyper linking a main file with N target files. However, the limitations of the claims do not show how the hyper linking occurs. In fact, the claims do not even suggest that hyper linking of a main file with N target files even occurs. Therefore, claims 12-41 are rejected as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 13-21, 23-31 and 33-41 are rejected as being dependent upon claims 12, 22 and 32.”

In response, Applicant has amended claims 12, 22, and 32 to change the word “encoding” to “hyperlinking” (in the “encoding” step) to track the language of the preamble.

For items 6-15 on pages 3-4 of the Office Action, the Examiner identifies lack of antecedent basis in claims 22, 23, 30, 32, 33, and 40.

In response, Applicants have inserted text similar to text appearing in claim 12. This text provides antecedent basis for language identified by the Examiner with respect to items 6-15 on pages 3-4 of the Office Action.

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 12-41 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Based on the preceding amendments, Applicant respectfully believes that all pending claims and the entire application meet the acceptance criteria for allowance and therefore request favorable action. If the Examiner believes that anything further would be helpful to place the application in better condition for allowance, Applicant invites the Examiner to contact Applicant's representative at the telephone number listed below. The Director is hereby authorized to charge and/or credit Deposit Account 09-0457 (IBM).

Date: 05/16/2007

Jack P. Friedman
Jack P. Friedman
Registration No. 44,688

Schmeiser, Olsen & Watts
22 Century Hill Drive – Suite 302
Latham, New York 12110
(518) 220-1850